



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Art Unit : 1742 Customer No.: 035811
Examiner : Sikyin Ip
Serial No. : 09/937,889
Filed : October 2, 2001
Inventors : Akio Tosaka Docket No.: 1307-01
: Sinjiro Kaneko Confirmation No.: 8803
: Yoichi Tominaga
: Noriyuki Katayama
: Nobutaka Kurosawa
: Kei Sakata
: Osamu Furukimi
Title : HIGH TENSILE HOT-ROLLED STEEL SHEET
: HAVING EXCELLENT STRAIN AGING
: HARDENING PROPERTIES AND METHOD
: FOR PRODUCING THE SAME

Dated: March 6, 2006

Mail Stop AF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8

For

Postcard
Response

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to **Mail Stop AF**, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date appearing below.

Name of Applicant, Assignee, Applicant's Attorney
or Registered Representative:

DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary US LLP
Customer No. 035811

By: _____ 

Date: _____ 6 MAR 2006



AF
ZPW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Art Unit : 1742 **Customer No.: 035811**
Examiner : Sikyin Ip
Serial No. : 09/937,889
Filed : October 2, 2001
Inventors : Akio Tosaka **Docket No.: 1307-01**
: Sinjiro Kaneko **Confirmation No.: 8803**
: Yoichi Tominaga
: Noriyuki Katayama
: Nobutaka Kurosawa
: Kei Sakata
: Osamu Furukimi
Title : HIGH TENSILE HOT-ROLLED STEEL SHEET
: HAVING EXCELLENT STRAIN AGING
: HARDENING PROPERTIES AND METHOD
: FOR PRODUCING THE SAME

Dated: March 6, 2006

RESPONSE

Mail Stop AF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is submitted in response to the Official Action dated January 3, 2006. The Applicants submit the following remarks in support of withdrawal of all of the rejections and prompt allowance of all the solicited claims.

The Applicants note the rejection of Claims 1-5, 10, 12, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112. The rejection takes the position that:

The instant claimed limitations N/Al ratio and N dissolved content in claims 1, 2, 10, and 12 have no literal support in the specification originally filed.

Also, the rejection states "N/Al being '0.3 or more' as originally claimed could merely mean 0.31 not 0.6 as instantly claimed. Same rationale holds true for N in the dissolved state."

The Applicants respectfully submit that the above position in the rejection does not properly state the requirements for §112 on the one hand and is inaccurate on the other hand. The Applicants will first address the claimed "N in the dissolved state being 0.0030% or more."